

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/772,164	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TSIEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey E. Russel	<b>Art Unit</b> 1654	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jeffrey E. Russel.

(2) Frank J. Mycroft.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 16 June 2006
**Time:** \_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**

None

**Claims discussed:**

55

**Prior art documents discussed:**


None

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**Jeffrey Edwin Russel**  
**Primary Patent Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1654**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner asked about claim 55, which refers to "the peptide of SEQ ID NO:2", although SEQ ID NO:2 does not define a peptide. Attorney stated that SEQ ID NO:4 was intended (see, e.g., page 6, lines 17-20, of the specification), and the examiner will continue the search on the assumption that SEQ ID NO:4 was intended..

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/772,164	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TSIEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey E. Russel	<b>Art Unit</b> 1654	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jeffrey E. Russel.

(2) Frank J. Mycroft.

**Date of Interview:** 29 June 2006

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*None*

Claims discussed:  
*55*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See examiner's amendment.*


  

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**Jeffrey Edwin Russel**  
**Primary Patent Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1654**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)